

REMARKS

Claims 1, 23, 30, 42, and 53 have been amended. New claims 67 to 79 have been introduced.

35 U.S.C. § 103 Rejections

The Examiner has rejected claims 1-8, 10-16, 20-35, 39-47, 50-59 and 61-66 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Gill et al., U.S. Patent No. 6,081,262 (hereinafter “Gill”) and Gadh et al., U.S. Patent No. 6,525,732 (hereinafter “Gadh”).

Gill teaches combining media objects of diverse types into an integrated media presentation. Gadh teaches navigating an object within the environment in which the object is displayed. The office action submits that Gadh teaches a virtual reality scene and associating each media object with a series of two-dimensional views of the object. The applicant respectfully disagrees. As discussed below, neither Gill nor Gadh teaches navigating two-dimensional (2D) objects having three-dimensional properties within a virtual reality scene and the combined disclosure of Gill and Gadh also fails to teach this limitation. Hence, the rejection does not establish a proper prima facie case of obviousness.

The office action submits that Gill “fails to explicitly teach the created scene is a virtual reality scene.” The applicant submits that Gadh similarly fails to teach, as recited by claim 1 of the presently claimed invention, a “virtual reality scene [that] is translatable and rotatable, and wherein translating and rotating the virtual reality scene results in changing the respective two dimensional views of the objects.”

The Gadh disclosure is limited to rotating an object within a stationary background environment. (Gadh, col. 9, lines 60-65.) The environment disclosed does not rotate when the object contained therein is rotated and the object contained in the environment does not rotate

when the environment is rotated.¹ Because the environment does not move with the object contained therein and vice versa, Gadh notes that “the background environment can be distracting,” and teaches that “it is desirable when feasible, to remove the background from the various images before the images are used for visualizing, manipulating, and navigating the object.” (Gadh, col. 10, lines 5-10.)

Therefore, Gadh fails to disclose a translatable and rotatable virtual reality scene and it teaches away from rotating or translating a scene such that the views of the objects contained therein change accordingly. Thus, neither Gill nor Gadh teaches or suggests the claimed virtual reality scene. Accordingly, the examiner fails to establish a prima facie case of obviousness because the combination of prior art disclosures, Gill and Gadh, fails to teach the virtual reality limitation as claimed in claim 1.

Claims 2-8, 10-16, 20-22, 24-29, 31-35, 37- 41, 43-52, 54-59, and 61-66 depend, directly or indirectly, with independent claims 1, 23, 30, 42, and 53. The examiner raised further objections based on the same prior art. However, because the cited art fails to recite the limitation recited by the independent claims, as explained above, the aforementioned dependent claims are not obvious in view of the cited art.

Applicant, accordingly, respectfully requests withdrawal of the rejection of claims 1-8, 10-16, 20-35, 39-47, 50-59 and 61-66 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Gill and Gadh.

The Examiner has rejected claims 18-19, 37-38 and 48-49 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Gill and Gadh, as applied to claims 1, 30 and 42 above, and further in view of Autry et al., U.S. Patent No. 5,724,106 (hereinafter “Autry”).

¹ Gadh notes, “In general, a user does not care about the background environment; he/she neither wishes to manipulate it nor examine it, since the object itself is the item of interest.” (Gadh, col. 9, lines 62-65.)

Claims 18-19, 37-38, and 48-49 depend directly or indirectly from independent claims 1, 30, and 42. As explained above, because the combined disclosure of Gill and Gadh fails to teach rotating objects within a virtual reality scene as recited by the independent claims, the addition of the Autry disclosure does not remedy the shortcoming.

Applicant, accordingly, respectfully requests withdrawal of the rejection of claims 18-19, 37-38 and 48-49 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Gill and Gadh and further in view of Autry.

Applicant respectfully submits that the present application is in condition for allowance.

If there are any additional charges, please charge them to our Deposit Account No. 022666. If a telephone conference would facilitate the prosecution of this application, the Examiner is invited to contact James C. Scheller, Jr. at (408) 720-8300.

Respectfully submitted,

BLAKELY, SOKOLOFF, TAYLOR & ZAFMAN LLP

Date: November 20, 2008



James C. Scheller, Jr.
Reg. No. 31,195

Customer No. 045217
1279 Oakmead Parkway
Sunnyvale, CA 94085-4040
(408) 720-8300